SEC65

From: Harrison Wang [redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 09, 2017 11:47 AM
To: Tanner Philp
Subject: Re: Updates on Kin

Hi Tanner,

Frankly, it doesn't seem like miscommuncation. It seems like a blatant lie. You mentioned those comments on September 18th (as well as when your official Twitter account mentioned all those exchanges were interested), which is when the tokens weren't selling out. So it seems like you were trying to manipulate buyers' sentiments to try to drum up more interest on a failed ICO. Again, when you "miscommunicate" these things, it effects the market, as distributing proportionally is not even close to burning much less the same thing. It introduces more supply into circulation and effects the dilution down the road. Whereas if you had burned, the future supply would hover around 7-8 trillion tokens now without bribing, it is 10 trillion. This significantly alters supply and demand. Chalking up money matters to "miscommunication" issues is a legal matter.

The exchanges are listing other tokens that don't have near the usability or utility for users as Kin. So that doesn't seem accurate either.

On Thu, Oct 5, 2017 at 9:08 PM Tanner Philp <tanner@kik.com> wrote:

Hey Harrison,

Thanks for the note. We really appreciate the support and engagement from you and your brother through this process.

The initial product that was released is a starting point and will go through the same product process that we have honed over 8+ years of product development. Starting with a smaller group of users and an initial product that we build, test, iterate and grow. This also allows us to work in parallel on scalability constraints of the Ethereum blockchain and what that means for product implementation.

The statement holds true that we have been given indication that exchanges have been evaluating Kin to list. Exchanges are taking a much more tactful approach to new projects than they may have in the past and a key variable is the usability and underlying utility to end users – that is where our current focus is, building out product.

As far as the redistribution – it was done proportionally to everyone's contribution so it does have the same impact on percentage ownership of the circulating supply. I apologize for the miscommunication originally on the tokens being

230

burned – we ultimately decided to redistribute the tokens pro-rata to all participants to maintain the 10 trillion total tokens, but % of the economy remained the same for all participants.

Let me know if you have any more questions or feedback.

Cheers,

Tanner

On Wed, Oct 4, 2017 at 4:49 PM, Harrison Wang <[redacted]> wrote:
Hi Tanner,

My brother ([redacted]) has relayed me his conversation with you.

Are there any updates besides a prototype of Kin wallet on Kik that only allows you to get stickers?

I had read on multiple sources from your team, including the Kin Foundation's own Twitter account that "We have been given indication from multiple exchanges this would happen shortly after the sale". When is this expected as its been almost 2 weeks since the sale has ended? Frankly this statement now seems deceiving in hindsight to drum up hype for the ICO sale. From everything I've read, it seems like your team provides the same generic response about how "its up the exchanges to list". This is not entirely true as the founding team of the ICO must also take steps to get the token listed. Has this been done?

Also, (as per your email with him) about the unsold tokens, on Sept 18th you wrote that "they are burned (not minted)...." when in fact the complete opposite happened. Your team didn't burn the tokens, but in fact minted them. What was the reasoning behind this? Having the "same effect as burning" by redistributing the unsold tokens, is actually not the same as it actually being burned (we've had this statement reviewed).

We really don't appreciate being deceived and kept in the dark considering we had invested so much into this. Please let me know.

Thanks,
Harrison